



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

He tilted with a sword-fish—Marry, sir,
The aquatic had the best—the argument
Still galls our champion's breech.

—*Old Play*.^a

All the mottoes of the chapters preceding this, with the single exception noted above, are credited to known authors; but ten of the fourteen following are signed "Old Play." A further examination of the novels shows that only one motto was chosen from an unknown or fictitious source before Scott wrote the *Antiquary*. This one is before the forty-eighth chapter of *Guy Mannering*, and the signature, "Old Border Ballad," merely indicates that he had forgotten what he derived it from. As a matter of fact, he was quoting the thirty-fourth stanza of the ballad, *Kinmont Willie*, included in his own collection, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*.^b In novels following the *Antiquary*, Scott quoted from "Old Play" ninety-one times, "Old Ballad" twenty times, "Old Song" seven times, "Anonymous" (which was probably employed in the same way) twenty-five times, "Old Poem" once, and "Ancient Drama" once; and in nearly every case the motto is believed by Dennis and other editors to be the novelist's own work.

WALTER GRAHAM.

Columbia University.

The History of the Chorus in the German Drama, by ELSIE WINIFRED HELMRICH.
New York, Columbia University Press, 1912.
8vo., paper, pp. ix + 95.

This book represents the development of the chorus 1. in the early church-plays, 2. under the influence of the Latin comedy, 3. from

^a The *Antiquary*, p. 280 (*ed. cit.*). The epigraph of chapter twenty-six, which later is signed "Old Ballad," appears without signature in the first edition.

^b *Guy Mannering*, chap. XLVIII, p. 344 (*ed. cit.*). *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, vol. II, p. 64 (Ed. Henderson, Edinburgh, 1902). The epigraphs of chapters six and forty-five were not signed in the first edition. Later, they were credited to "*As You Like It*" and "*Shenstone*." *Waverley* has no mottoes.

Gryphius to Gottsched, 4. in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The undertaking is ambitious and the difficulties that beset it are great. Not the least of these is that, for the second and third periods treated, the country's resources in texts are inadequate. It is a sad fact that in spite of the efforts of Kürschner, Goedeke and Tittmann, Hermann and Scamatolski, and others, the number of reprinted texts is comparatively small. Of course, those plays that are remarkable from an esthetic point of view have mostly been reprinted, but it is not always in the most artistic dramas that the most significant changes in the development of dramatic forms occur. There are, I believe, a certain number of original seventeenth-century editions scattered through the libraries of this country, but they are practically out of reach, unless they happen to be in one of the two or three largest universities.

It may be tempting to trace the beginnings of the chorus in the medieval drama and to proclaim its triumph in Wagner, but the facts do not seem to me to warrant the assumption. There may be a superficial resemblance between the development of Greek tragedy and the relation between the medieval drama and the liturgical chant, but the cases are far from being similar. As Miss Helmrich says herself (p. 2): "Even before the dramatic element had begun to develop, the [ancient] chorus had reached an artistic form." It had become a lyric form of art, which took its place in the dialogue and combined with it, thus forming an organic whole, in which its function became more and more definite. Aristotle based his definition of it on the loftiest achievements of Greek tragedy. A chorus is a specific element of the drama: we have admirable examples of it; its functions have been defined by one of the world's finest critics, and even if he had not been a Greek philosopher of the highest standing, writing about artists who were almost his contemporaries, and with a broader experience than any of our philologists can hope to have, nobody could impeach his *a posteriori* remarks about the functions of the chorus. Therefore it seems hardly scientific to declare that one

will "use the term chorus when referring to the choir" (p. 12) of medieval liturgy. The choir is not a definite form of art. After the dialogue of medieval drama had sprung from it, it did not take its place in the drama, assuming an organic function. Miss Helmrich must repeatedly have felt the sterility of her parallel; at least, some of her own very sensible conclusions should have brought it home to her. Summing up this chapter, Miss Helmrich finds that "one cannot really speak of the evolution of the chorus in the religious drama" (p. 21). How could a thing which never became an organic part of the drama be expected to evolve? One might as soon expect the butterfly's cast-off chrysalis to develop.

I do not so completely disagree with the author when she tries to identify Wagner's music with the chorus. And yet, it will not do to simply tell us that "the rôle played by the [modern] orchestra is *much the same* as that played by the chorus in the Greek tragedy" (p. 86). Such is Wagner's opinion, I know, but is it safe to base a whole investigation on such a vague statement? In my opinion, Wagner's music is not a real chorus. It cannot be said to fulfil, in anything like the original sense, the first two functions assigned to it by Aristotle, *i. e.*, be an actor in the play, and be an inherent, *i. e.*, an indispensable part of the whole. As to the third requisite, it all depends on one's personal interpretation of "*συμπαυλίζεσθαι*." It is true that, according to the best of those interpretations, the orchestra might at least partly fulfil it: whether one agrees with Schiller's conception of the chorus as "furthering and accompanying the plot," or thinks with Baumgart that it should contribute to bring about the *katharsis*, or credits it with the novel but important function of starting emotions among the spectators, as Hirn suggested.

Miss Helmrich does not appear to be firmly enough grounded in the history of the theories of the chorus. It is a great pity that she did not make use of Dr. W. F. Klein's excellent book (*Der Chor in den wichtigsten Tragödien der französischen Renaissance*, Erlangen, 1897), the first 51 pages of which treat with authority

of the development of the theories of the chorus from Aristotle down to the latest poetics, and which contains a discussion of Schiller's use of the chorus, so thorough as to make us rather critical towards later writings on the same theme. Klein ignores German criticism before Gottsched, in which he may be wrong. But it is nevertheless to be deplored that, even for seventeenth-century Germany, Miss Helmrich should have had to rely exclusively on G. Popp. I should have liked Miss Helmrich's method better if her book had been one for which the ground had been sufficiently prepared by a series of reliable '*Vorarbeiten*.' But this subject, as seen here, is new. Klein's book seems to me to show the safest way of approaching the subject: a painstaking way, to be sure, not fertile in direct large results, a little too German, perhaps, for the practical trend of our time, but the right way nevertheless. Klein knows the theories in detail, and then analyzes a number of tragedies and their choruses with an eye to the three aspects of the Aristotelian definition: the technical, the material, the dramaturgic. He completes this by metrical studies and esthetic valuations.

Let us now turn to some less general points. Following Creizenach, Miss Helmrich states that Reuchlin introduced choruses into his *Henno*¹ in imitation of Greek comedy. She quotes Reuchlin's commentary to the word "comediam" in line 3 of the prologue, but the passage from Diomedes which she adds in a footnote is not convincing. If anything, this passage, ending as it does with the express statement "*Latinae igitur comoediae chorum non habent*" would have deterred Reuchlin from introducing choruses into his Latin comedy. Furthermore, this passage refers to Greek comedy in general, not to one *aetas*. It is more likely that the passage referred to, if any, is this one (Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, I, 489): "*secunda aetate fuerunt Aristophanes, Eupolis et Cratinus, qui et principium vitia sectati acerbissimas comedias composuerunt.*" But

¹ I am surprised that Miss Helmrich should have been unable to obtain Reuchlin's *Henno*, which has been reprinted, together with his *Sergius*, by Holstein, in 1888.

whether he had the choruses or the general nature of the play in mind, when he marked it as a comedy of the ancient Attic type, we do not know. To be sure, the play may be considered as a satire of astrologers and lawyers, and that may explain the association with the three dramatists he mentions. It seems to me less probable that he was thinking of the choruses, especially in Aristophanes and Eupolis, where they began to dwindle away, till they entirely disappeared in the so-called "intermediate comedy." Nevertheless Miss Helmrich's idea of Greek influence on Reuchlin, even in the matter of the chorus, is very probably right. Holstein (l. c., p. 145) thought that the chorus might have been introduced for the sake of the music, Reuchlin's patron, Bishop Johann von Dalberg, being a great lover of music. Creizenach (II, p. 48) also points out that Reuchlin's own love of music might have brought him to do so. That the idea of writing a regular chorus in the Greek manner was in his mind is again suggested by his trying, in the commentary, to show how the choruses, at least the first two, are connected with the body of the play. Besides, Reuchlin has told us, in his *Sergius*, where he tentatively inserted his first chorus song:

Si senserit placuisse primitias suas
Faciet deinde *integras* comedias.
(*Sergius*, Prologus.)

It strikes me as rather comical when the author says of the meter of the Latin chorus songs (p. 39) that they are "generally . . . in iambic or trochaic dimeter, asclepiad, sapphic, glyconic or alcaic meter." What else generally?

Miss Helmrich may confuse our ideas about the early Reformation drama, first speaking, as she does, of a Swiss "Tendenzdrama" which she connects with Gengenbach's *Der Totenfresser* (not *Die*) and Nic. Manuel's *Ablasserkrämer* (1525), and then surprising us by saying: "Then came the Reformation," etc.

To come down to matters of mere detail, I do not understand Note 44 of Chapter II. Did not also the audience of a Passion-play know the whole plot beforehand? The stage-direction "pausando" does not necessarily point to

instrumental music (p. 40). In Vondel's *Palamedes* there are not only two (p. 47), but four choruses, the others being a "Rey van Peloponnesers en Ithakoisen" and a "Rey van Trojaensche Maeghden."

Too much space would be taken up if all the problems that have been suggested by the reading of this book were to be stated here. Take, for instance, the question: why did the Humanists introduce a chorus at the end of the fifth act, whereas their greater familiarity with Latin tragedy could be expected to make them followers of Seneca, rather than induce them to develop a fashion which was still embryonic even in Greek tragedy? In how far did Horace's moralistic and didactic interpretation influence the chorus? How much havoc was worked by the misreading of "autoris partes" instead of "actoris"? What about the introduction of German choruses into Latin plays "für die kleinen Schüler, welche noch kein Latein verstehen," as Schöpperus said in 1602, or for other purposes? What was the precise relation between the chorus and the interlude, the chorus and the dumb shows, the chorus and the "lustige Person"? . . .

We have measured this book by an ideal standard, but this should not make us overlook its merits. It shows intelligent industry, clearness and forcefulness of thought, and creditable expression. It is the first book attempting to cover the subject as a whole. It contains many just and interesting remarks, and, as it stands, will certainly prove of use as a preliminary survey of the field.

JOS. E. GILLET.

University of Wisconsin.

Saint Vincent de Paul. Textes choisis et commentés par J. CALVET. Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1913. ii + 336 pp. (Bibliothèque Française, dirigée par F. Strowski.)

It was an excellent idea of Mr. Strowski's to include *Saint Vincent de Paul* in his collection of French classics of the seventeenth century, and it is to be hoped that the literary